

**REMARKS**

**Present Status of the Application**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office action dated February 20, 2008. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 remain pending.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. As for the prior art rejections, claims 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sawabe (USPAP 2003/0146893; "Sawabe" hereinafter), while claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawabe.

Applicant has most respectfully considered the remarks addressed in this Office action. By way of entry the proposed amendments, it is believed the 112 rejections of the claims 1-3 are overcome, while claim 4 is canceled for reflecting the amendment to claim 1 at issue. Regarding the 102(e) and 103(a) rejections, Applicant has amended claim 5 as furnished hereinbefore without introducing any new matter, and hereby respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 5 are fully supported by the specification. In order to have the proposed amendments considered, Applicant hereby files a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-7 remain pending in the present invention. In view of the following discussions, a notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

**Discussion of Office Action Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112**

*Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention.*

Applicant has amended claim 1, and hereby submits that the foregoing amendments have been made for purpose of better defining the invention in response to the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In regard to the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner has asserted that the claim discloses undefined characters such as "J", "K", "L", "M", and "N". Applicant has carefully amended claim 1, and hereby submits the characters "J", "K", "L", "M", and "N" are defined clearly. Moreover, Applicant has cancelled the claim 4 to reflect the amendment to claim 1.

**Discussion of Office Action Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102**

*Claims 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sawabe.*

As well defined in the MPEP 2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

With respect to claim 5 of the instant application, as currently amended, it recites,

“A driving method for a pixel array, the pixel array comprising a plurality of pixels, the pixel array corresponding to a plurality of gate lines and a plurality of data lines, the pixels respectively corresponding to a plurality of pixel electrodes, the driving method comprising:

**grouping the pixels in each row into a plurality of pixel sets logically;**

driving two adjacent pixels in two of the pixel sets in the same row respectively by the same gate line;

**driving a first pixel and a second pixel in the same pixel set by two different gate lines respectively, wherein the first pixel and the second pixel are in two adjacent columns respectively;** and

**driving the pixels in each column respectively by the same data lines, wherein the driving polarities of the adjacent data lines are opposite to each other,**

wherein when the gates line are sequentially enabled, the driving polarities of the pixel electrodes of the pixels in the same pixel set are substantially the same and **the driving polarities of the pixel electrodes of the pixels respectively in the adjacent pixel sets are substantially opposite to each other.**”(Emphasis added)

In FIG. 2 of Sawabe, the pixels in adjacent columns and in the same row in the liquid crystal panel are **driven by the same gate line**, whereas in the claim 5 of the present invention, the first pixel (e.g. the pixels 356 depicted in FIG. 3) and the second pixel (e.g. the pixels 358 depicted in FIG. 3) in adjacent columns in the same pixel set (i.e. in the same

row) are driven by the two different gate lines. Therefore, in light of the above statement, it is evident that the driving method for the pixels proposed by the present invention is totally different from that taught by Sawabe.

Moreover, since the driving method for the pixels in the present invention and the driving polarities of the adjacent data lines are opposite to each other, the driving polarities of the pixel electrodes of the pixels respectively in the adjacent pixel sets are substantially opposite to each other when the gates line are sequentially enabled. In addition, if the driving polarities of the pixel electrodes of the pixels respectively in the adjacent pixel sets are substantially opposite to each other, the ratio of the traverse electric field is reduced and the aperture ratio is enhanced. Similarly, in the paragraphs [0034]~[0036] of the specification of the present invention, it is stated, "if the voltage is applied starting for the data line 306 is + - + - + - + -, ... Therefore, the positive voltage of the data line 306 is applied to the pixel electrode of the pixel 340 via the passing circuit 370 controlled by the gate line 330, and thus the voltage applied to the pixel electrode of the pixel 340 is a positive voltage. ... Alternatively, the negative voltage of the data line 309 is applied to the pixel electrode of the pixel 356 adjacent to the pixel 342 at the same column as the voltage required by the pixel 356 is negative. ... In summary, after the pixels are divided into a plurality of pixel sets, a voltage having substantially same phase is adopted to a pixel electrode of the pixel of the same pixel set. And at least two voltages with phases substantially opposite to each other are applied to the pixel electrodes of the pixels of two of the adjacent pixel sets respectively."

Based on the above discussion, Sawabe fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 5 of the present invention. Thus, Sawabe does not anticipate claim 5, and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn. In addition, dependent claim 7 is also not anticipated by Sawabe as a matter of law, and thus the 102 rejection should be withdrawn.

**Discussion of Office Action Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103**

*Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawabe.*

Applicant submits that claim 6 depends on the allowable independent claim 5 which is non-obvious over the Sawabe reference based on the above-mentioned ground, and thus claim 6 should also be allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/709,715  
Docket No.: 11586-US-PA

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-3 and 5-7 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

May 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw)